

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMUNISM'S CHARACTER UN- CHANGED

Cach
HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Anderson, S.C., Free Press of August 15, 1968, contains a syndicated column entitled "Communism's Character Unchanged," written by the distinguished columnist Mr. Thurman Sensing. This column, reasserting a belief in the monolithic threat of communism, appeared in print a full week before the Soviet show of power by invading Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Sensing offers ample admonition for the need of a serious reevaluation of our Nation's foreign policy. Whereas he uses the Czechoslovakian incident as just another example to illustrate the Soviet power over the satellite countries, he also brings to mind the far more important idea of the monolithic threat of the Communist world.

The author is a strong opponent of the popular idea that the Communist world is divided and exists in a polycentric nature. To the new generations of Americans who have been nurtured with such propaganda and to those who have never experienced the flagrant tactics of a Stalin or a Beria, he offers us the following recent reminders of Soviet brutality: Hungary, 1956; the exploits in Africa; the entanglements in the Middle East; the penetration in Southeast Asia; Cuba, 1962; and now Czechoslovakia, 1968.

Mr. President, can we detect any mellowing in the Communist ideology? Do we now have any reason to doubt Moscow's direction of events in the satellite countries? Czechoslovakia is merely the most recent example.

However, even when presented with such evidence as this recent episode, our policymakers neglect to realize that Moscow still "calls the shots" in the Communist world.

Men such as Mr. Sensing are performing a valuable service to our Nation by constantly reminding us of the Soviet challenge. Such a prophetic voice crying in the wilderness is not always greeted with honor or popular reception, but such a mission is a noble and valuable one as the tide of history affirms his judgment.

I invite the attention of the Senators to this column and I implore them to take notice of Mr. Sensing's timely words. I concur in his beliefs. I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNISM'S CHARACTER UNCHANGED

Whatever the immediate outcome of the Czechoslovakian situation, it should be clear from a reading of recent news that Communism has not changed its character. Hopefully, American "liberals" who have been saying that the Russia of today is vastly different from the Russia of Stalinist times

will acknowledge to themselves and to others that they were wrong.

A few years ago Walt Whitman Rostow, then head of the State Department Policy Planning Council and now a top White House adviser, was the author of the thesis that Communism is "mellowing." The Czechs, however, have discovered that there is nothing mellow about the thinking or actions of the Soviet Union. As soon as the Soviets saw that their power position in Czechoslovakia was even slightly threatened, they began to display their military muscle. They demanded that the Czechs fall into line.

One of the pet phrases of recent years has been "polycentricism," meaning a variety of centers. The "liberals" vowed that communism no longer has a single center, Moscow, but is decentralized and developed in a variety of independent ways. From the Czech situation, however, we can see that the Russians hold that they are the one and only source of policy for the Communist world. They demand that their Central European satellites toe the mark and respect the authority of communism in the Soviet Union.

The end result of these developments on the international scene is that communism can be viewed as having the same face it had under Dictator Joseph Stalin. It is still an armed doctrine representing the Soviet dictatorship and utterly opposed to the slightest breath of personal or economic freedom.

It is instructive that the Czech situation should develop in this period before the American presidential election. The future of the cold war is still the chief issue facing the American people. If the U.S. fails to actively strive for victory in the cold war, it will continue to lose ground in the worldwide conflict between capitalism and communism.

A new generation of Americans has grown up with no memory of the communist record of tyranny and betrayal. Young Americans in their twenties aren't old enough to remember the soft-on-Communism outlook of the Roosevelt New Deal, the giveaway of lend lease supplies to the USSR, the surrender of Eastern Europe to the Russians at the end of World War II. These young Americans don't have personal recollections of the Soviet spy cases which showed that the Russians built their first atomic weapons on the basis of information stolen from the U.S. or supplied by traitors. They don't recall the case of Alger Hiss, the high-ranking State Department official who served as a Soviet agent.

Older Americans need to help educate younger Americans and explain to them how the interests of the U.S. were sacrificed by disloyal elements and appeasement types in our midst. The young also need to know about the struggle of anti-communists in this country over a 20-year period. They should be informed as to who stood for firmness against Communism and who had an ignorant or sentimental view of the communist threat to freedom. Young voters should ask themselves where the leaders and candidates of today stood in the decisive struggles involving communism and the cold war. For example, what was Hubert Humphrey's view of the Hiss case when it was the raging issue of the moment? Or, looking at more recent events, what was Mr. Humphrey's view when President Kennedy ordered withdrawal of U.S. missiles from Turkey in exchange for the alleged removal of Soviet rockets from Cuba?

These questions aren't ancient history. They are living questions that pertain to basic attitudes regarding the cold war, the struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of tyranny.

The record will show that America's "lib-

erals" have been consistently wrong about communism for 20 years. They have laughed at anti-communists, saying they "see Reds under beds." Meanwhile, the Soviets have swept on from success to success, capturing Cuba and penetrating Africa, the Middle East and Southeast Asia. The "liberals" have been determined to see communism as containing reforming elements, whereas communism is as brutal and ambitious as ever. The United States is in danger today because "liberals" have guided American foreign policy. It is imperative that there be a change in leadership in Washington, in foreign policy thinking as well as in the handling of domestic strife, which also stems from communist agitation.

America hasn't much time to adopt a new, vigorous posture toward the communist threat. The people need to act in 1968.

CRISIS IN AMERICA

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to deliver the keynote address to the annual convention of the Disabled American Veterans in Philadelphia, Monday, August 19, 1968. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of my remarks, as follows:

CRISIS IN AMERICA

There is one, few can doubt. In the past decade we have seen: Our cities convulsed with mindless destruction in the name of "civil rights"—universities shut down by self-styled revolutionaries in the name of "academic rights"—sedition and draft evasion by cowards and over-educated milquetoasts, in the name of "morality"—militants and radicals openly advocating guerrilla warfare and anarchy in order to disrupt the democratic process and overthrow the government, in the name of "freedom"—a youth culture anesthetized and sustained by drugs, in the name of "self-expression"—hippies and flower children aimlessly wandering and littering the streets in the name of "love and peace"—an unprecedented, steadily rising crime rate, five times faster than the population—the assassination of political leaders—and finally, a shambles of primitive lawlessness in the nation's capital, in the name of "the right to equal shares for everybody."

What is happening in America? Why do we indulge and permit these excesses and outrages? Why do so many, even now, continue to perpetrate and sanction them? The answers, while complex, are not as difficult and mysterious as they may seem.

At the heart of the problem is an age-old moral dilemma with which every healthy society must come to terms. It is that of balancing the rights of the individual against the good of society as a whole; drawing the fine line between the function of government and the obligation of the citizen to himself and to his country. A stable, vigorous democracy must preserve the proper balance between the duties of government and the responsibilities of its citizens—each must uphold, so to speak, its end of the bargain. When one is exaggerated at the expense of the other, and the balance is lost, societies decay and eventually collapse from within. Rome fell when

E 7674

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks September 5, 1968

its citizens became so obsessed with greed and personal ambition that they lost sight of the long range goal—the good of the nation as a whole (without which there can be no fulfillment of individual interests).

In many ways we are experiencing symptoms of a similar moral breakdown. We are slowly losing perspective in the proper role of government in relation to the individual and are abandoning genuine rights for the sake of instant satisfaction of needs and desires. Too many of us confuse the desire for something with the right to something. There are certain rights in a free democracy which are the function of government to guarantee and protect. Among these is the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. But there are other so-called rights, about which we hear a great deal lately, which are not really rights at all. They have taken on an aura of credence as "rights" because of the myths surrounding them. In the process of perpetrating these myths, genuine rights—such as the right of the majority to freedom from fear, to protection by the law, and to the freedom to choose—have been so twisted and degraded that not only has its true meaning been obscured, but the acts committed in its name have made a mockery of its original intention. It is becoming increasingly fashionable today to justify almost anything by calling it a "right".

It is time to take another look at the mythical rights on the altar of which we are slowly sacrificing our legitimate rights. Liberty does not mean license from the law. The right to dissent means protest within the bounds of law, not mob rule. The right to the pursuit of happiness means equal opportunity, not guaranteed income and equal shares.

The recent so-called "poor people's campaign" is a good example of misguided goals under the banner of "rights". Democracy calls for equal opportunity under the law. It does not believe in guaranteeing equal results for everybody irrespective of effort. It is not the function of government to guarantee prosperity for everyone. It is the function of government to provide a climate in which everyone is free to prosper. The present outcry for "equal rights" for the poor is really a demand for "special rights" for equal shares. While an affluent society ought to help those who cannot help themselves, and whereas we do cultivate the ideal of charity to the extent that we are probably the most giving nation in the world, that is charity and not a basic right. It is a gross distortion of the concept of equal opportunity to equate it with the right to equal shares. There is no such right in a free democracy. The right to equal property is a cardinal principle of communism. Even communistic countries have abandoned it because the apathy it breeds stifles everyone and in the end benefits no one.

The philosophy of equal shares is contrary to a man's fundamental right to place a value on his work. A man's work is an expression of himself. When you deprive him of the means by which to judge the quality of his efforts, namely, proportionate reward, you take away not only the dignity and incentive of work, but also pride in achievement. The philosophy that goes with the demand for guaranteed income is not only impractical, it is a direct denial of principles which have made this the richest nation in the world—the right to competition, free enterprise, and reward based on merit.

A popular fallacy perpetrated in connection with welfare demands is the belief that a huge segment of America is hopelessly trapped in grinding poverty. First, the so-called poverty is not as grinding as many like to believe. Professor Parish—a professor of economics at the University of Illinois—cites in a study entitled "Poverty in America: The Myth and the Reality", that based on consumer statistics, 96 percent of the U.S. fami-

lies currently own T.V. sets, and in the active age group, 90 percent own cars. Over half the families with annual income under \$3,000 have telephones, and among those with incomes under \$5000, 60 percent have telephones. A 1967 Bureau of Census survey of the kinds of things poorer families buy showed that of those under 25 years of age and earning less than \$3,000 annually, 6 percent bought new automobiles and 49 percent bought used ones; 54 percent purchased T.V. sets. A TIME magazine survey of hunger showed that even in Mississippi's Tunica County, one of the poorest in the nation, 8 out of every 10 families living on less than \$3,000 a year, 37 percent owned washing machines, 48 percent owned cars, and 52 percent had T.V. sets. You cannot eat or wear cars and T.V. sets. A major portion of the so-called poverty stricken class of America enjoys fruits of affluence which the middle-classes of Europe cannot, or are only now beginning to be able to, afford, not to mention the rest of the world.

Secondly, it is a myth that poorer people in this country are "hopelessly" trapped. Today in America, anyone who really wants to work, and is willing to work, can get an education and a job. Thousands are working at something they are able to do while learning an additional skill. Yet, every day, as the demands for more money grow louder, the want ads grow longer with job offers, and the welfare lists grow longer with people who either lack the skills to fill the jobs or consider them too menial to be worth their while.

The trend today to make the government the scapegoat for every conceivable social ill is as irresponsible and unrealistic as the belief that the government can miraculously cure these ills in one stroke. For every 100 poor people, there are 100 different reasons. The instruments of government are not finely enough tuned to solve the individual grievances of 200 million Americans. The government can, and does, throw billions of dollars each year into attacking the root causes, such as lack of education and ignorance of available opportunities.

But there are some things which are simply beyond the realm of government and money to cure. More often than not, the underlying causes of poverty are lack of initiative or just plain laziness. The government cannot make a man learn a skill. It cannot keep a woman from having children for whom she is unable to care. Money will not buy incentive, perseverance, the will to work, or the desire to take advantage of educational and job-training programs. It will not buy the wisdom or prudence to use one's money for balanced foods, instead of a shiny new automobile or a color T.V. set.

The core of the poverty problem often is psychological, not physical. We should be fighting human attitudes that cause poverty. We should stop appealing to men's weaknesses and start appealing to their strengths. Instead of excusing ourselves by blaming the government for every social ill, we should accept the responsibilities that rightly belong to the individual. We should replace the ethics of slavery—the brazen demands that "somebody do something" and the slogans that "the government owes it to us"—with the ethics of self-reliance. The leaders of the so-called poor people's campaign would do better to substitute self-reliance for servility and initiative for dependence. The illusion that society is responsible for one man's misery accomplishes nothing. It re-enforces the vicious idea that he is the victim of circumstances, incapable of self-support, instead of teaching him to rely on his own resources.

Akin to the poverty issue are the social abuses committed in the name of civil rights. Most people agree that the right to dissent must end where another man's freedom begins. Yet the same people who pay lip-

service to peaceful protest, excuse violence when they feel it serves a useful purpose. They may feel that it takes disobedience of a law to change the law. These people may decide in their own minds which laws are worth obeying. They then find it easy to justify every kind of social atrocity in the name of civil rights.

No society can tolerate a breakdown of its laws and expect to survive. Dissent is healthy when it acts as a catalyst for needed improvement and change. But constructive change must come about as a steady, slow, and sure evolution; it cannot take place violently. Reform by anarchy and guerrilla tactics, using fear and crime as weapons, is self-defeating. Without laws, and more importantly, without the enforcement of those laws, there can be neither justice nor freedom. "Human rights" is a meaningless phrase when there are no laws to define them and no means to safeguard them. Law and order is the only thing that protects the rights of the individual from tyranny—a tyranny in which strength is measured by brute force and the laws of the jungle, not by the laws of justice.

That so much coercion and violation of the law has been allowed is, I believe, due in part to an unspoken assumption that, because there are social reasons for it, somehow it isn't crime. In part it is due simply to the spineless response of our national leaders. They excuse themselves by perpetrating the myth that violence is an inevitable result of just grievances and civil rights issues—that riots are spontaneous expressions of grief and rage for centuries of oppression. This is a convenient charade. The riots in Washington, for instance, had little to do with civil grievances. Self-styled revolutionaries and hoodlums saw an excuse for kicks—a chance to feel important in the only way they approve—through guns and molotov cocktails—using fear to gain the illusion of power. It escalated into an orgy of looting, vandalism, and arson when bystanders saw an easy way to get something for nothing. For two weeks, the Constitution of the United States was virtually suspended. There were hundreds of fires, eleven dead, one by the forces of law; property damage in the millions. And many persons felt afterward that congratulations were in order—that law enforcement officials had handled the uprising peacefully!

The rioters were not the ignorant, the oppressed, and the poor, as many would like to believe. A ball bond analysis of those arrested showed that 90 percent had jobs paying from \$85 to \$150 a week. Many of the rioters drove to the riot area in their cars. Washington, D.C. has few so-called oppressed people. It has a negro mayor, many negroes in high offices, fully integrated schools and little unemployment. The average citizen paid the price—in lost jobs, burned homes, incessant fear, not to mention the cost of millions of dollars in property damage and the bill for added police protection.

It is time to put an end to the soft-line response to lawlessness. Too much disorder has been permitted in the name of personal advantage under the guise of civil rights. Even if there were a just cause, which there is not, no end could justify the means. Our first duty is to uphold the law to protect the rights of the majority. Law-abiding citizens have a right to the streets without fear, a right to their taxes spent for constructive purposes, and above all, a right to the preservation of their property.

The current excuse for the permissive approach, that property is not as valuable as lives, is totally wrong. It not only establishes a dangerous precedent, which could result in complete anarchy, it is mistaken in principle. Property rights, along with the right to live, are among the oldest of all